DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 295 973 TM 011 780

AUTHOR Hart, Craig H.
TITLE Children's Expectations of the Outcomes of Social Strategies: Relationships to Sociometric Status and Parental Disciplinary Styles.
PUB DATE Apr 88
NOTE 18p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 5-9, 1988).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cognitive Development; Conflict; *Discipline; Elementary Education; Elementary School Students; Family Environment; Grade 1; Grade 4; Interpersonal Relationship; *Mother Attitudes; Parent Child Relationship; Parent Role; Peer Acceptance; *Peer Groups; Social Cognition
IDENTIFIERS *Outcomes Expectancy; *Sociometric Status

ABSTRACT

The relationships between maternal disciplinary style and children's consequential thinking skills and how children think about consequences of actions in peer group conflicts were studied in 144 children from grades 1 (N=59) and 4 (N=85) and their mothers. Seventy additional children underwent sociometric testing. Home disciplinary style was established through interviews. Children were presented with hypothetical conflict situations and possible strategies, concerning home outcome expectations and peer rating and nomination. Moderate correlations indicated that mothers who were more power-assertive had children who were more rejected, less liked, less accepted, and less preferred as playmates by their peers. Children of power-assertive mothers perceived more hostile means of resolving peer conflict as enhancing relationships. The findings are consistent with a model suggesting that children may acquire some consequential thinking tendencies through interactions with their mothers in disciplinary contexts; this may influence peer status. Parental disciplinary styles may indirectly influence peer status as mediated by children's outcome expectations. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED295973

Children's Expectations of the Outcomes of Social Strategies: Relationships to Sociometric Status and Parental Disciplinary Styles

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

CRAIG H. HART

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Craig H. Hart
Department of Family and Child Studies
Louisiana State University

Paper presented at the April, 1988, meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

TM011780

CONSEQUENTIAL THINKING SKILLS AS MEDIATORS OF PARENTAL DISCIPLINARY STYLES AND CHILDREN'S PEER STATUS

While the results of many studies have documented direct relations between parental disciplinary and/or interactive styles and children's peer status (e.g., Baumrind, 1967; 1971; Deutsch, 1974; Jennings, 1975) few studies have assessed indirect relationships between parenting variables and peer status as mediated by social cognitive and/or behavioral variables (cf. Parke, MacDonald, Beitel, and Bhavnagri, in press; Pettit, Dodge, and Brown, 1988). In light of the view that family and peer relations represent interconnected spheres of influence (cf. Hartup, 1979), recent research efforts have focused on exploring familial correlates of children's low status among members of the peer group in an attempt to identify precursors of problematic peer relations during the early childhood years. Such research has been fostered by accumulating evidence indicating that problematic peer relations in early childhood constitute a risk factor for later personal and social adjustment difficulties (Kupersmidt, Coie, Dodge, & Rabiner, in press; Parker & Asher, 1987).

A substantial body of literature exists suggesting that children acquire many of their social cognitions and behavior that lend themselves to peer acceptance or rejection in the context of the family (see Maccoby & Martin, 1983). The purpose of this study was to explore whether children's consequential thinking skills are mediators of parental disciplinary styles and children's reputation with peers in elementary school settings. Specifically, the primary objective of this study was to explore (a) relations between maternal disciplinary styles and children's consequential thinking skills and (b) possible subsequent relations between how children think about consequences for actions in peer group conflict situations and their peer status.

In a broad sense, researchers have identified two major types of disciplinary strategies that could conceivably be related to children's social expectation knowledge of how others will likely view and respond to their own behavior (i.e., consequences or outcome expectations). These are generally referred to as "induction" and "power assertion" (cf. Brody & Shaffer, 1982; Hoffman, 1977). As Burleson (1983) has pointed out, parents who use more inductively oriented disciplinary styles introduce claims and supply rationales that support these claims by reasoning and explanation rather than by focusing upon coercive means to regulate behaviors (e.g., "You shouldn't call Johnny names because it hurts his feelings. That makes him mad, and then he wants to hurt back"). Such claims and rationales may serve to focus the child on how their actions may impact upon relationships with others (i.e., relationship outcome expectations). Power assertive disciplinary styles, on the other hand (e.g., physical punishment, threats, etc.) are focused almost exclusively on the attainment of a self-oriented outcome of getting the noncompliant child to comply (instrumental outcome expectation) with little concern for relationship or psychological

consequences. Therefore, parents who rely on power-assertive approaches may be inadvertently modeling power assertive strategies as an efficacious means of resolving interpersonal issues that result is successful or positive instrumental outcomes (i.e., they work to obtain child compliance).

As has been suggested, if children develop tendencies to envision consequences for their actions in certain ways based on information that is gleaned from parents in disciplinary situations, it is likely that these tendencies will carry over in their interactions with peers. A number of studies have collectively demonstrated that unpopular children tend to cite less adaptive and more instrumental solutions to social problem solving situations with peers (e.g., antagonistic, less friendly). In contrast, more popular children tend to cite more prosocial, sophisticated relationship enhancing strategies (e.g., Krasnor, 1983; Renshaw & Asher, 1982; 1983).

Rubin and Krasnor (1986) suggest that perhaps one reason rejected children suggest and implement less adaptive strategies in such situations may be due to the lack of consideration of appropriate consequences for their actions. Indeed, recent evidence indicates that popular and and unpopular children have different outcome expectations when presented with possible outcomes of more hostile strategies (e.g., threatening to hit another child) that could be employed in resolving hypothetical social conflicts with peers (Crick & Ladd, 1986; 1987). Specifically, when compared to more popular peers, rejected children appear to focus more on positive instrumental outcomes (e.g., will this strategy work in getting what is wanted) while minimizing relationship outcome possibilities (e.g., will this strategy effect my relationship with the peer). While the work of Crick and Ladd focused primarily on third-, fourth-, and fifth-graders, this study was designed to assess differences in both older (i.e., fourth-graders) and younger (i.e., first-graders) children's social outcome expectations for strategies employed in peer group conflict situations. In addition, this study explored whether outcome expectation tendencies children have for unfriendly and assertive strategies are related to parental disciplinary styles.

Method

Sample

The subjects were 144 first and fourth grade children attending two midwestern elementary schools and their mothers (59 first and 85 fourth graders). An additional 70 part-study children participated in sociometric testing. Children and parents in the sample were predominantly white and heterogenous with regard to socio-economic status (SES) as assessed by the Hollingshead four-factor index (Hollingshead, 1975).

Instruments

Home disciplinary style interview. Mothers and children were interviewed in their homes over the summer prior to their children's entrance into the first and fourth grades. Mothers were asked in individual tape-recorded interviews to respond to six pretested hypothetical situations describing disciplinary contexts (e.g., child calling another child names or stealing a toy from another a child). Several of the situations employed in the present study were adapted from situations employed by Bearison and Cassel (1975), and Applegate et al. (1985). Rather than using disciplinary strategy

selection procedures, mothers' open-ended responses to these situations were elicited to avoid item desirability bias (cf. Burleson et al., 1987).

Based on the suggestions of several researchers regarding the need to elaborate the power assertion-induction dichotomy into a comprehensive continuum that captures varying shades or degrees of these contrasting disciplinary styles (Applegate et al., 1985; Burleson, 1984), an extensive hierarchical coding scheme was developed for use in this study. Maternal inductively oriented consequential reasoning responses comprized the upper end of the continuum and power-assertive oriented responses comprized the lower end. The hierarchical placement of other types of responses (e.g., those that included combinations of inductive and power assertive components) were made within the framework of theoretical or empirical justifications.

Although not empirically grounded, researchers view hierarchically ordered coding systems as being similar to Guttman scales, in that the use of a particular strategy level implies the capacity to use all strategy levels lower on the hierarchy. Previous research using hierarchically ordered coding schemes in varying content areas have demonstrated that a person capable of using a high-level strategy might also suggest lower level strategies when asked for other ways that they might deal with the situation. Although reversion to the use of lower level strategies is a possibility, the converse does not appear to be true (cf. Applegate, 1980; Burleson, 1984). Since a subject's response to stimulus situations may contain multiple disciplinary strategies codable within different hierarchical levels, most research has focused on the highest level strategy used in responding to the situation. As Loevinger and Wessler (1970) suggest, the highest-level scoring algorithm is appropriate when the characteristic being studied is viewed primarily as capacity (i.e., parental highest level strategy implies the capability to use that strategy as well as lower level strategies). Therefore, the highest level strategy elicited from mothers for each situation was selected for use in creating scores that were used in subsequent analyses. These scores were created by averaging the highest level strategies elicited for each of the six situations.

Two coders were trained and reliably unitized the text and coded the maternal responses from interview transcripts. Twenty percent of the transcripts were duplicated and randomly inserted in each coding packet to provide a means of assessing reliability. Unitizing reliability was assessed by using Guetzkow's Index (Guetzkow, 1950). This index is based on the premise that two independent, equally skilled coders unitize a text each into the same specifiable number of segments representing relevant disciplinary idea units. Analyses using this index indicated that there was a discrepency of only 12.2 percent between the coders and the best estimate of the true number of units (the average of the two coders' estimates). Cohen's Kappa (Cohen, 1960) for the highest level response codes was .86. Analyses were also conducted to assess cross-situational consistency in highest level strategy use by mothers. Cronbach's coefficient alpha was .75 for the six regulative situations.

Home Outcome Expectations interview. During the home interview over the summer prior to the beginning of school, children were presented with two hypothetical conflict situations and twenty-four strategies representing four strategy types that varied with respect to their friendliness and assertiveness (e.g., Unfriendly-assertive strategy--"What would happen if you

said in a mean voice, 'Hey! Give me back my bike!'"). Bipolar relationship and instrumental outcome possibilities were presented for each strategy (e.g., instrumental outcome--the kid would give or not give you your bike; relationship outcome--the kid would or would not want to play with you sometime). This was a modified version of that employed by Crick & Ladd, 1987. The approach also entailed the utilization of a four-point scale for each item by placing two identical scale points on each side of the bipolar response alternatives (i.e., "would happen sometimes" or "would happen most of the time"). Situations, strategies, and outcome possibilities were presented in a counterbalanced order. Higher scores were indicative of the child envisioning more positive relationship or instrumental outcome possibilities for a particular strategy type. Moderate levels of internal consistency were obtained for items comprising this measure for each separate strategy dimension. Cronbach's alphas were .71 and .73 for the relationship and instrumental sub-dimensions of unfriendly-assertive strategy types. Split-half reliability for these two sub-dimensions was .78 and .80, respectively.

Thirty percent of the sample was retested upon entering school in the fall. Test-retest correlations indicated low to moderate levels of stability for relationship and instrumental outcome expectations in the unfriendly-assertive strategy dimension (r's equal .42 to .60, respectively).

Peer rating and nomination procedures. Peer rating and nomination measures were also employed in children's classrooms in the fall to assess their sociometric status. Procedures outlined by Renshaw and Asher (1982, 1984) and Coie and Dodge (1983) were closely followed. Due to differences in reading ability levels, picture board peer nomination and rating scale procedures were followed for first graders while peer nomination and rating scale questionaire methodology was used for fourth graders.

Seperate positive and negative nomination scores were created by summing the "votes" children received for each criterion. Each of these scores (i.e., average ratings, number of positive nominations, and number of negative nominations were then standardized within classrooms to construct the following measures: (a) peer liking/acceptance (positive nominations); (b) peer disliking/rejection (negative nominations); and (c) group acceptance (average ratings). Standardized positive nominations (p) and negative nominations (n) received by each child were then used to create two additional measures of social preference (Zp - Zn) and social impact (Zp + Zn) (cf. Coie, Dodge, & Coppetelli, 1982; Coie & Dodge, 1983; Newcomb & Bukowski, 1983; Perry, 1979).

In order to reduce the number of sociometric measures used in subsequent analyses and to eliminate redundancy among these variables, a principle factors analysis was performed. The purpose of this procedure was to identify a minimum number of possibly unrelated measures that would account for a maximum amount of the variation in a larger set of variables. Varimax rotation was employed since measures loading on any resulting factors were to be used as separate dependent measures (see Tabachnick & Fidell, 1983). Since the group-acceptance, peer-liking, peer-preference, and peer-rejection measures were found to account for most of the total variation (92%) in the peer status measures, these were retained for further analyses. Accordingly, the social-impact measure was eliminated.

Results and Conclusions

Relations among predictors and criteria

Correlational analyses were used to explore the relations both within and between predictors and criteria. For ease of interpretation, scores on the heirarchical coding scheme were reversed (i.e., higher to lower and lower to higher) to better indicate the direction of effects pertaining to power-assertive disciplinary styles. They are reported accordingly in table 1. Consistent with past research, moderate correlations indicate that mothers who were more power-assertive (i.e., less inductive) had first-and fourth-grade-children who were more rejected, less liked, less accepted, and less preferred as playmate companions by their peers. These relations appear to be stronger for younger as compared to older children. Higher levels of socio-economic-status were similarly related to measures of classroom competence but in opposite directions.

Examination of bivariate correlations also indicated that mothers who were more power-assertive in their disciplinary styles had first- and fourth-grade children who tended to expect to get their way (i.e., have positive instrumental outcome expectations) when using more hostile means of resolving peer conflict. In addition, first-grade-children who expected more hostile strategies to lead to self-oriented gains had tendencies to be more rejected, less liked, less accepted and less preferred as playmate companions by their peers. First grade children of more power-assertive mothers also had tendencies to perceive more hostile means of resolving peer conflict as relationship enhancing. Furthermore, these children had slight tendencies to be more rejected and less accepted by their peers.

Predicting outcome expectations and peer status

For each set of hypotheses exploring relationships between parental disciplinary styles, children's outcome expectations for social strategies, and classroom peer status, a series of hierarchical regression analyses were employed. Children's sex was always entered on the first step of the analysis to explore gender differences and control for their effects on subsequent predictors. Grade level, SES, and parental disciplinary style scores (or outcome expectation scores depending on the hypothesis being tested) were entered into the equation in that order on separate steps to examine their separate and overall contributions. To explore two- and three-way predictor interactions and their contributions, variables representing predictor interactions involving grade, sex, SES, and outcome expectations (or parental disciplinary styles) were entered last (see Cohen & Cohen, 1983). To reduce the number of predictors, a series of regressions were performed on each criterion in which each of the interaction terms was alternatively entered on the final step of the analysis. For ease of interpretation, only those predictor interaction terms that yielded significant increments are reported in subsequent tables. Results for each criteria, including the proportion of variance accounted for by individual predictors and tests of significance for each R^2 increment increase are also reported in the tables that follow.

Earlier correlational findings were generally supported by subsequent regression analyses in which low to moderate amounts of variance in outcome expectations and peer status were accounted for. After controlling for sex, grade, and SES, results indicated that mothers who were more power-assertive

had both first-and fourth-grade children who were more rejected, less liked, less accepted, and less preferred as playmate companions by their peers (See table 2). Results of further within grade analyses of marginally significant parenting style by grade interactions suggest that findings pertaining to relations between power-assertion and peer liking and rejection held true for first graders in particular.

Additional analyses showed small but significant incremental predictions indicating that mothers who were more power-assertive in their disciplinary styles had first- and fourth-grade children who tended to expect to get their way (i.e., have positive instrumental outcome expectations) when using more hostile means of resolving peer conflict (e.g., threatening to hit another child) (See table 3). In addition, first-and fourth-grade children who expected more hostile strategies to lead to self-oriented gains had marginal tendencies to be less preferred as playmate companions. Further analyses of significant outcome expectation by grade interactions indicated that this held true for first graders in particular. Moreover, first-grade children who expected to get their way by using more hostile means had tendencies to be rejected by their peers.

Results of analyses to this point suggest that power assertive mothers may be modeling power assertive strategies as an efficacious means of resolving interpersonal issues that result in successful outcomes (i.e., they work to obtain child compliance). It appears that younger children, in particular, glean similar tendencies from mothers to focus on such self-oriented expectations for more hostile strategies while minimizing relationship concerns. Such expectations in peer group situations is associated with peer rejection and lower levels of peer preference.

Taken together, these findings are consistent with (although clearly not a confirmation of) a model suggesting that children may acquire at least some consequential thinking tendencies through interactions with their mothers in disciplinary contexts, which in turn may influence their peer status. In this view, parental disciplinary styles my exert an indirect influence on peer status as mediated by children's outcome expectations. This possibility was examined next in a manner similar to that which was conducted in the recent Pettit, Dodge, and Brown (1988) study.

Testing Models of Developmental Paths

The path from parental disciplinary styles to outcome expectations to social competence. In the next set of analyses, we tested the hypothesis that the relation between parental disciplinary styles and children's peer status is mediated by children's outcome expectations. Accordingly, the relation between parental disciplinary styles and peer status was assessed while statistically controlling for children's positive outcome expectations for unfriendly-assertive strategies. Peer rejection and peer preference measures were used for the peer status criterion since earlier analyses indicated that both parenting styles and positive instrumental outcome expectations were related to these criteria as well as to each other. It may be recalled that the relation involving the peer rejection measure held true for first graders only. As shown in table 4, parental power assertion still provided a significant incremental prediction of peer preference, particularly for first graders, even when instrumental outcome scores were entered first. The same was true for the prediction of first grader's peer rejection scores.

It would appear, then, that children's positive instrumental outcome expectations for unfriendly-assertive strategies do not necessarily serve a mediating role between power-assertive disciplinary styles and children's peer status as measured by peer rejection and peer preference scores. Rather, a more direct path of influence seems to be occuring between parental disciplinary styles and children's peer status. However, it is also possible that positive outcome expectations for unfriendly-assertive strategies predict peer status only in conjunction with parental disciplinary styles. This possibility was examined next.

The path from outcome expectations to parental disciplinary styles to peer status. In the next set of analyses we examined the degree to which the relation between positive instrumental outcome expectations for unfriendly-assertive strategies and peer status was mediated by parental disciplinary styles. Again, peer preference and peer rejection measures were used for the peer status criterion since earlier analyses indicated that both positive instrumental outcome expectations and parental disciplinary styles were related to peer status as well as to each other. Again, earlier analyses involving the relation between positive instrumental outcome expectations and peer rejection were significant only for first graders. As shown in table 4, although positive instrumental outcome expectations did not predict peer preference for the sample as a whole, they still predicted peer preference and peer rejection for first graders following the removal of variance attributable to parental disciplinary styles. These findings suggest that peer status is not influenced by positive instrumental outcome expectations for unfriendly-assertive strategies in combination with power-assertive disciplinary styles.

The path from parental disciplinary styles to peer status to outcome expectations. A final possible path of influence is that leading from parental disciplinary styles to peer status to positive instrumental outcome expectations for unfriendly-assertive strategies. Such a path of influence would indicate that parental disciplinary styles and positive instrumental outcome expectations are mediated by peer status. This would suggest that power-assertive disciplinary styles and positive instrumental outcome expectations are somehow interchangeable or redundant. Further analyses indicate that this is not the case. As shown in table 5, parental disciplinary styles still predicted positive instrumental outcome expectations for unfriendly-assertive strategies after controlling for peer status measures.

The results of these analyses suggest that parental disciplinary styles make seperate and independent contributions to children's outcome expectations for unfriendly-assertive strategies and to children's peer status. Perhaps this is due to direct modeling effects associated with parental disciplinary practices. In addition, findings suggest a direct relation between self-oriented outcome expectations for more hostile strategies and peer rejection for first-grade children that are independent of parental disciplinary styles.

Table 1
INTERCORRELATIONS AMONG THE SUMMARY MEASURES WITHIN AND BETWEEN DOMAINS

		Classroom Competence			Positive Outcome Expectations		Power Assertive Discipline Style	SES
		1	2	3	4	1	2		
Classroom competence:									
1. Peer Liking	Full		-.51c	.64c	.86c	-.16a	-.13	-.25c	.28c
	First		-.66c	.72c	.89c	-.28b	-.20	-.40c	.26b
	Fourth		-.41c	.74c	.84c	-.07	-.07	-.14	.29b
2. Peer Rejection	Full			-.61c	-.86c	.20b	.14a	.40c	-.32c
	First			-.68c	-.90c	.36b	.12	.50c	-.41c
	Fourth			-.62c	-.83c	.04	.03	.30c	-.28b
3. Group Acceptance	Full				.72c	-.31c	-.25c	-.27c	.27c
	First				.76c	-.34b	-.16	-.38c	.34b
	Fourth				.82c	-.02	-.01	-.19b	.28b
4. Peer Preference	Full					-.22b	-.16a	-.36c	.34c
	First					-.40c	-.20	-.48c	.38b
	Fourth					-.02	-.06	-.25b	.33c
Positive Outcome Expectations: (Unfriendly-Assertive Strategies)									
1. Instrumental	Full						.65c	.28c	-.17a
	First						.67c	.25b	-.18
	Fourth						.29c	.25b	-.22b
2. Relationship	Full							.21b	-.08
	First							.22b	-.06
	Fourth							.12	-.16
Maternal Disciplinary Style:									
	Full								.32c
	First								.19
	Fourth								.41c

NOTE.-- Full = Full sample, N = 143; First = First grade, N = 59; Fourth = Fourth grade, N = 84.
a = $p < .05$; b = $p < .01$; and c = $p < .001$.

Table 2
Results of the Regressions Performed on the Positive Instrumental Outcome Scores for Unfriendly-Assertive Strategies and the Peer Status Criteria: Significant Findings with Parental Disciplinary Style Scores as a Predictor

CRITERION/PREDICTORS (Step)	R^2	Change in R^2	F
*UAINS			
Sex	.00	.00	.02
Grade	.28	.28c	27.03c
SES	.31	.03a	20.65c
*PAR	.33	.02a	17.00c
Peer Liking			
Sex	.00	.00	.04
Grade	.00	.00	.05
SES	.08	.08c	3.83b
*PAR	.11	.03a	4.07b
PAR x Grade	.14	.03a	4.15c
Peer Liking (First Grade)			
Sex	.00	.00	.22
SES	.07	.07a	2.09
PAR	.22	.15b	5.09b
Peer Rejection			
Sex	.00	.00	.50
Grade	.03	.03	2.14
SES	.13	.10c	7.11c
*PAR	.21	.08c	9.15c
PAR x Grade	.23	.02+	8.05c
Peer Rejection (First Grade)			
Sex	.01	.01	.54
SES	.18	.17c	6.09c
PAR	.36	.18c	10.09c
Group Acceptance			
Sex	.00	.00	.83
Grade	.19	.18c	15.94c
SES	.26	.07c	16.02c
*PAR	.28	.02+	13.11c
Peer Preference			
Sex	.00	.00	.34
Grade	.01	.01	.72
SES	.13	.12c	6.18c
*PAR	.19	.06b	7.87c

Note.-- df for tests on R^2 increments were 1,142 for UAINS as a criterion, 1,141 for full sample peer status criterion, and 1,57 for first grade peer status criterion.
t = $p < .10$; a = $p < .05$; $p < .01$; and c = $p < .001$.
*PAR = Parental Disciplinary Style
*UAINS = Unfriendly-Assertive Instrumental Outcome Scores

Table 3
Results of the Regressions Performed on the Peer Status Criteria: Significant Findings with Positive Instrumental Outcome Scores for Unfriendly-Assertive Strategies as a Predictor.

CRITERION/PREDICTORS (Step)	R^2	Change in R^2	F
Peer Rejection			
Sex	.00	.00	.50
Grade	.03	.03a	2.15
SES	.13	.10c	7.11b
*UAINS	.14	.01	5.57b
UAINS x Grade	.18	.04b	6.06c
Peer Preference			
Sex	.00	.00	.34
Grade	.01	.01	.73
SES	.13	.12c	6.81c
*UAINS	.15	.02+	5.91c
UAINS x Grade	.18	.04a	6.13c
Peer Rejection (First Grade)			
Sex	.01	.01	.37
SES	.18	.17b	6.09b
*UAINS	.26	.08a	6.33c
Peer Preference (First Grade)			
Sex	.00	.00	.03
SES	.15	.15b	4.83b
*UAINS	.26	.16c	6.27c

Note.-- df for tests on R^2 increments were 1,142 and 1.57 for peer status criterion scores (Full Sample and First Grade respectively).
t = $p < .10$; a = $p < .05$; b = $p < .01$; and c = $p < .001$.
*UAINS = Unfriendly-Assertive Instrumental Outcome Scores

Table 4. Results of the Regressions Performed on Peer Preference and Rejection Criteria with Parental Disciplinary Style Scores and Positive Instrumental Outcome Score Criteria as Predictors (Controlling for *UAINS and Parental Disciplinary Style Scores)

CRITERION/PREDICTORS (Step)	R^2	Change in R^2	F
Predicting Peer Status from Parenting Style			
Peer Preference			
Sex	.00	.00	.34
Grade	.01	.01	.73
SES	.13	.12c	6.81c
*UAINS	.15	.02+	5.91c
PAR	.20	.05a	6.61c
PAR x Grade	.22	.02a	6.34c
Peer Preference (First Grade)			
Sex	.00	.00	.03
SES	.15	.15b	4.83c
*UAINS	.26	.16b	6.27c
PAR	.38	.12c	8.26c
Peer Rejection (First Grade)			
Sex	.01	.01	.37
SES	.18	.17b	6.09b
*UAINS	.26	.08a	6.33c
PAR	.39	.14c	8.77c
Predicting Peer Status from *UAINS			
Peer Rejection			
Sex	.00	.00	.50
Grade	.03	.03a	2.14
SES	.13	.10c	7.11c
PAR	.21	.08c	9.15c
*UAINS	.21	.00	7.30c
UAINS x Grade	.25	.04b	7.67c
Peer Rejection (First Grade)			
Sex	.01	.01	.54
SES	.18	.17c	6.09c
PAR	.36	.18c	10.09c
UAINS	.40	.04+	8.77c
Peer Preference			
Sex	.00	.00	.34
Grade	.01	.01	.73
SES	.13	.12c	6.81c
PAR	.19	.06b	7.88c
UAINS	.20	.01	6.61c
UAINS x Grade	.23	.03b	6.82c
Peer Preference (First Grade)			
Sex	.00	.00	.03
SES	.15	.15b	4.83b
PAR	.32	.17c	8.54c
UAINS	.38	.06b	8.26c

Note.-- df for tests on R^2 increments were 1,142 for full sample peer status criterion and 1,57 for first grade peer status criterion.
t = $p < .10$; a = $p < .05$; b = $p < .01$; and c = $p < .001$.
*PAR = Parental Disciplinary Style
*UAINS = Unfriendly-Assertive Instrumental Outcome Scores

Table 5

Results of the Regressions Performed on the Positive Instrumental Outcome Score Criteria with Parental Disciplinary Style Scores as a Predictor (controlling for peer status).

CRITERION/PREDICTORS (Step)	R^2	Change in R^2	F
Predicting *UAINS from Parenting Style			
*UAINS			
Sex	.00	.00	.04
Grade	.27	.27c	26.35
SES	.30	.03b	20.29c
Peer Rejection	.31	.01	15.44c
*PAR	.33	.02b	13.38c
Peer Liking	.32	.01	15.88c
*PAR	.33	.02b	13.71c
Peer Preference	.32	.01	16.16c
*PAR	.33	.02+	13.78c
Group Acceptance	.31	.00	15.30c
*PAR	.33	.02a	13.40c

Note.--df for tests on R^2 increments were 1,141 for Positive Instrumental Outcome Criteria for Unfriendly-Assertive Strategies.
t = $p < .10$; a = $p < .05$; $p < .01$; and c = $p < .001$.
*PAR = Parental Disciplinary Style
*UAINS = Unfriendly-Assertive Instrumental Outcome Scores

LIST OF REFERENCES

Applegate, J.L., Burke, J.A., Burleson, B.R., Delia, J.G., & Kline, S.L. (1985). Reflection-enhancing parental communication. In I. E. Siegel (Ed.), Parents' constructions of child development. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Baumrind, D. (1967). Child care practices anteceding three patterns of preschool behavior. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 75, 43-88.

Baumrind, D. (1971, January). Current patterns of parental authority. Developmental Psychology Monograph, 5(1, Part 2), 1-103.

Bearison, D.J. & Cassel, T.Z. (1975). Cognitive decentration and social codes: Communicative effectiveness in young children from different family contexts. Developmental Psychology, 11, 29-36.

Brody, G.H., & Shaffer, D.R. (1982). Contributions of parents and peers to children's moral socialization. Developmental Review, 2, 31-75.

Burleson, B.R. (1983). Interactional antecedents of social reasoning development: Interpreting the effects of parent discipline on children. In D. Zarefsky, M.O., Sillars, & J.R. Rhodes (Eds.), Argument in transition: Proceedings of the third summer conference on argumentation (pp. 597-610). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Burleson, B.R. (1984). Comforting communication. In H.E. Sypher & J.L. Applegate (Eds.), Communication by children and adults: Social cognitive and strategic processes (pp. 63-104). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Burleson, B.R., Wilson, S.R., Waltman, M.S., Goering, E.M., Ely, T.K., & Whaley, B.B. (1986). Item desirability effects in compliance-gaining research: Seven empirical studies showing why the checklist methodology produces garbage. Paper presented at the convention of the Speech Communication Association.

Cohen, J., & Cohen, P. (1983). Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral science. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Coie, J.D., & Dodge, K.A. (1983). Continuities and changes in children's social status: A five-year longitudinal study. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly 29, 261-281.

Crick, N.R., & Ladd, G.W. (1986, May). Children's perceptions of the outcomes of social strategies: Do they vary as a function of sociometric status and/or age? Paper presented at the meeting of the Midwestern Society for Research in Life-Span Development.

Crick, N.R.,, & Ladd, G.W. (1987, April). Children's perceptions of the consequences of aggressive behavior: Do the ends justify being mean? Paper presented at the Society for Research in Child Development Conference, Baltimore, MD.

Deutsch, F. (1974). Female preschoolers' perceptions of affective responses and interpersonal behavior in videotaped episodes. Developmental Psychology, 10, 733-740.

Guetzkow, H. (1950). Unitizing and categorizing problems in coding qualitative data. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 6, 47-58.

Hartup, W.W. (1979). The social worlds of childhood. American Psychologist, 34, 944-950.

Hoffman, M.L. (1977). Moral internalization: Current theory and research. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology, Vol. 10. New York: Academic Press.

Jennings, K.D. (1975). People versus object orientation, social behavior, and children. Developmental Psychology, 11, 511-519.

Krasnor, L. (1983). An observational case study of failure in social problem solving. Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 4, 81-98.

Kupersmidt, J., Coie, J.D., Dodge, K.A., & Robiner, D. (in press). Longitudinal studies of rejected and neglected children. In S.R. Asher and J.D. Coie (Eds.) Peer Rejection in Childhood: Origins, Consequences, and Intervention. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Loevinger, J., & Wessler, R. (1970. Measuring ego development: Vol. I. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Maccoby, E.E., & Martin, J.A. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. In P. Mussen (Ed.), Handbook of child psychology, Vol. 4. New York: Wiley.

MacDonald, K., & Parke, R.D. (1984). Briding the gap: Parent-child play interaction and peer interactive competence. Child Development, 55, 1265-1277.

Parke, R.D., MacDonald, K.B., Beitel, A., & Bhavnagri, N. (in press). The role of the family in the development of peer relationships. To appear in R. De V. Peters and R.J. McMahan (Eds.), Marriages and families: Behavioral treatments and processes. New York: Brunner-Mazel.

Parker, J.G., & Asher, S.R. (1987). Peer relations and later personal adjustment: Are low-accepted children at risk? Psychological Bulletin, 102, 357-389.

Pettit, G.S., Dodge, K.A., & Brown, M.M. (1988). Early Family Experience, Social Problem Solving Patterns, and Children's Social Competence. Child Development, 59, 107-120.

Putallaz, M. (1987). Maternal behavior and children's sociometric status. Child Development, 58(2), 324-340.

Renshaw, P.D., & Asher, S.R. (1982). Social competence and peer status: The distinction between goals and strategies. In K.H. Rubin & H.S. Ross (Eds.), Peer relationships and social skills in childhood. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Renshaw, P.D., & Asher, S.R. (1983). Children's goals and strategies for social interaction. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 29, 353-374.

Rubin, K.H., & Krasnor, L.R. (1986). Social-cognitive and social behavioral perspectives on problem solving. In M. Perlmutter (Ed.), The Minnesota symposa on child psychology (Vol. 18). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.